

on this. Do we stand for reform or do we stand for big money? I hope it is for reform.

TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER TO CHINESE BAD FOR U.S. NATIONAL SECURITY

(Mr. RILEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Speaker, our Commander-in-Chief and our President's national security doctrine seems to be "anything for a buck."

A 1997 Pentagon report revealed that a defense contractor had given highly technical information regarding a failed space launch to the Great Wall Industry. Great Wall also produces key components to China's strategic nuclear missiles. The Pentagon concluded that this transfer of information damaged our United States national security, and the Department of Justice has been conducting a criminal investigation into the transfer.

That is until the President got involved. The President, however, approved a waiver for the export of that same technology, effectively killing the criminal investigation. Conveniently, the chairman of the aerospace firm being investigated was the largest donor to the Democratic Party last year.

The Clinton Administration continues to follow a policy of helping its friends at the expense of national security. It does not take a Pentagon report or a rocket scientist to figure out that the transfer of missile technology to the Communist Chinese is bad for the United States national security.

MARRIAGE TAX PENALTY

(Mr. ROGAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROGAN. Mr. Speaker, no sane individual, if asked to start from scratch, would come up with the current tax code in a million years. A tax code that is baffling even to the experts is indefensible.

One of the aspects of the tax code that is particularly obnoxious is the marriage tax penalty. Many people do not learn about the marriage tax penalty until they get married. Then they discover all of a sudden that the Government wants to make sure that couples just starting out have a little bit tougher time than they had planned.

Perhaps most surprising of all is the fact that the marriage penalty can be stiffest for those who can afford it least, the working poor. Those who benefit from the earned income tax credit can face a marriage penalty that can only be described as destructive.

This tax code monstrosity should have been done away with years ago. It will take a Republican Congress to do away with it now. I urge my colleagues to pass H.R. 3734.

GLOBAL WARMING TREATY

(Mr. KNOLLENBERG asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, on December 11, 1997, the United States became a signatory to the Kyoto Protocol, or so-called global warming treaty. They did this despite the fact that the treaty went against the unanimous advice of the Senate.

In Kyoto, the administration completely ignored the Senate position and did exactly the opposite. Now there is wide concern that the administration is working proactively to implement the Kyoto targets through the back door. Part of this stems from the EPA indicating its plan to draft new clean air rules enacting portions of the Kyoto protocol.

That is why I introduced the American Economy Protection Act, H.R. 3807, which will ensure that the Kyoto Protocol is not implemented through the regulatory process. H.R. 3807 would prevent the administration from implementing this dangerous treaty in the absence of Senate ratification by requiring that Federal funds cannot be used for rules, regulations, or programs designed to execute the Kyoto Protocol.

This bill maintains the integrity of the United States Constitution and supports continued economic growth in this country. I urge support of this bill.

IMMIGRATION REFORM AND IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1998

(Mr. ROGERS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, are my colleagues tired of hearing about thousands of felons being naturalized as American citizens by an agency out of control? Are my colleagues tired of having lost control of our borders? Are they tired of a bureaucracy that allows millions of illegal aliens simply because they overstayed while on a legal visa?

Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to overhaul and dramatically improve the Nation's immigration system. The bill would enact the reforms proposed by the bipartisan Commission on Immigration Reform, headed by the late Barbara Jordan.

These reforms, received by Congress last year, are based on the most comprehensive bipartisan study of our immigration system to date and they offer a common-sense approach to fixing a system that is broken, failing the citizens it is supposed to protect and the immigrants it is supposed to serve.

Since 1984, the Congress has increased the budget of the INS by over 600 percent, yet illegal immigration is at an all-time high and service for illegal immigrants is at an all-time low. Money is no longer an excuse. By im-

plementing these changes, we can end the 3-year backlogs in benefits processing, end the granting of citizenship to criminals and other undeserving individuals, and end the mismanagement of our entire immigration system.

HIGH TECHNOLOGY TRANSFERS TO COMMUNIST CHINA

(Mr. COOKSEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. COOKSEY. Mr. Speaker, it might very well be impossible to prove the quid pro quo which seems obvious to all observers, Chinese money to the Democrats in exchange for high technology to the Chinese.

But whether the Clinton administration changed the policy to give high technology to the Chinese because they were taking millions of dollars in illegal campaign donations or not, the scandal is still the same.

Why did the Clinton administration go against its own Defense Department and the Department of State in giving sensitive technology to Communist China? I would like to insist on this point. Taking campaign money from Communist China is a crime, a serious crime. Crimes have been committed. But giving high technology to Communist China and endangering national security is an even more serious crime.

The first subverts democracy and is evidence of political corruption. But the second puts the lives of 265 million Americans at risk; and that, Mr. Speaker, is the biggest crime of all.

□ 1030

QUESTIONS REMAIN UNANSWERED BY LORAL SPACE AND COMMUNICATIONS

(Mr. TIAHRT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, I have here in my hand a copy of a two-page statement released by the Loral Space and Communications Group in response to recent allegations that, after large contributions to the Democrat party, Loral aided the communist Chinese government with the development of the "Long March" missile, jeopardizing the security of the United States.

As always, the scandal is not what is in the statement but what is left out, what Loral is not telling us. If Loral is correct that no sensitive information and no significant technology was conveyed to the Chinese, why then did the State Department and the Defense Department oppose the administration's granting of a waiver?

Did Loral violate its own policy by providing a report to the Communist Chinese before consulting with the State Department? Was not Loral specifically advised by the U.S. Government not to go forward with their review of the Chinese investigation of the "Long March" missile failure?